

1 MAXWELL M. FREEMAN, #31278
LEE ROY PIERCE, JR., #119318
2 MICHAEL L. GUREV, #163268
THOMAS H. KEELING, #114979
3 FREEMAN, D'AIUTO, PIERCE,
GUREV, KEELING & WOLF
4 A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION
1818 Grand Canal Boulevard, Suite 4
5 Stockton, California 95207
Telephone: (209) 474-1818
6 Facsimile: (209) 474-1245
E-mail: lrpierce@freemanfirm.com
7 mgurev@freemanfirm.com
tkeeling@freemanfirm.com

8 Attorneys for Defendants A.G. Spanos
9 Construction, Inc.; A.G. Spanos
Development, Inc.; A.G. Spanos
10 Land Company, Inc.; A.G. Spanos
Management, Inc., The Spanos Corporation
11

12 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

14 National Fair Housing Alliance, Inc., et al.,)	CASE NO. C07-03255-SBA
)	
15 Plaintiffs,)	REQUEST BY THE SPANOS
)	DEFENDANTS FOR LEAVE TO
16 vs.)	NOTICE A MOTION FOR
)	RECONSIDERATION; PROPOSED
17 A.G. Spanos Construction, Inc., et al.)	ORDER; PROPOSED POINTS AND
)	AUTHORITIES
18 Defendants.)	
)	[N.D. Cal. Local Rule 7-3]

19
20 Hearing Date:

21 Time:

22 Dept:

Complaint Filed: June 20, 2007

23 **REQUEST**

24 Pursuant to Northern District Local Rule 7-9, the Spanos Defendants respectfully
25 request leave to notice a motion to reconsider. By order issued on April 4, 2008, this court
26 denied the Spanos defendants' entire motion to dismiss. Footnote 2 to this court's order states:

27 The Ninth Circuit recently addressed the question of when the
28 FHA's two-year statute of limitations begins to run in *Garcia v.*

Brockway, 503 F.3d 1092, 1101 (9th Cir. 2007). However, the Ninth Circuit has agreed to rehear the case *en banc*, and therefore *Garcia* cannot provide any guidance to this Court. See 512 F.3d 1089 (“The three-judge panel opinion shall not be cited as precedent by or to any court of the Ninth Circuit”)

Order, p. 7, fn 2.

This court’s order also explained:

Plaintiffs have clearly alleged a “continuing violation” of the FHA by the Spanos Defendants, alleging that they “engaged in a continuous pattern and practice of discrimination against people with disabilities” since 1991 by “designing and/or constructing” apartment complexes that deny full access to and use of the facilities as required under the FHA, FAC, ¶ 4, and therefore none of the claims of the FAC against the Spanos Defendants are barred by the statute of limitations.

Order, p. 9:15-20.

On May 13, 2008, the Ninth Circuit (en banc) issued its opinion in *Garcia v. Brockway* ___ F.3d ___, 2008 U.S. App. LEXIS 10258 (9th Cir. 2008). The opinion explains that the continuing violation doctrine is inapplicable to “design and construct” discrimination claims brought under 42 U.S.C. section 3604(f)(3)(c). See *id.*, 2008 U.S.App. LEXIS 10258 at pp. *12-*14; and see Proposed Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed concurrently herewith.

CONCLUSION

The above change in the law presents good cause for this court to issue an order allowing the Spanos Defendants to notice a motion for reconsideration.

Dated: June 2, 2008

FREEMAN, D’AIUTO, PIERCE, GUREV,
KEELING & WOLF

By 

LEE ROY PIERCE, JR.

Attorneys for Defendants A.G. Spanos
Construction, Inc.; A.G. Spanos Development,
Inc.; A.G. Spanos Land Company, Inc.; A.G.
Spanos Management, Inc., The Spanos
Corporation